

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION

MELVIN HINES,	:	
	:	
Petitioner	:	
	:	
VS.	:	
	:	
Warden MICHELLE MARTIN,	:	NO. 7:06-cv-8(HL)
	:	
Respondent	:	<u>ORDER</u>

Petitioner **MELVIN HINES** initially filed a letter with the Northern District of Georgia, which docketed the letter as a habeas petition and transferred it to this Court. By order dated January 30, 2006, this Court instructed petitioner to present his claims on the standard 28 U.S.C. § 2254 forms required by this Court and to either submit the \$5.00 filing fee or execute and return a financial affidavit seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Petitioner was given thirty (30) days in which to comply with the Court's order. Petitioner was advised that his failure to comply with the Court's order would result in the dismissal of this action.

The thirty days have now elapsed and petitioner has failed to comply with the Court's January 30th Order.¹ The liberal construction that is granted *pro se* litigants in filing their complaints does not mean that they are allowed lack of compliance with deadlines that are imposed by law. "Liberal construction does not mean liberal deadlines." *Wayne v. Jarvis*, 197 F.3d 1098, 1104 (11th Cir. 1999). Consequently, the within action is hereby **DISMISSED**, without prejudice.

1. On February 3, 2006, the Court received a letter from petitioner which essentially repeated petitioner's claims from his initial letter. Petitioner's February 3rd letter may have crossed in the mail with this Court's January 30th order, but in any event, said letter clearly does not comply with the Court's order.

SO ORDERED, this 9th day of March, 2006.

s/ **Hugh Lawson**
HUGH LAWSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

cr